REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Tran (U.S. Patent No.5, 541, 924). Claims 1-14 are still pending of which the claims 1 and 6 have been amended in order to eliminate its improper dependency without the introduction of any new matter to the claims. In response thereto, Applicants would respectfully traverse the rejections as follows and reconsiderations for allowance of the presently pending claims 1-14 are respectfully requested.

Discussion for amendment to claims

From paragraph [37] in specification, there discloses "a time slot Ts is provided, wherein the width of the time slot is X times of the time interval Td, and X is a positive number. For example, $Ts=2*Td$ in FIG. 2A, and $Ts=3*Td$ in FIG. 2B. M is an integer larger than 0. For example, $Tr=3*Ts$ in FIG. 2A, and $Tr=2*Ts$ in FIG. 2B." That is, X and M can be limited to "a positive number equal or larger than 2,"and "M is an integer larger than 1." Thus, in claims 1 and 6, the recitation of "X is a positive number" is amended to "X is a positive number equal or larger than 2" without introducing any new matter. Likewise, the recitation of "M is an integer larger than 0" is amended to ""M is an integer larger than 1." without introducing any new matter.

Discussion for rejection to claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

2. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Tran (U.S. Patent# 5, 541,924).

In response thereto, applicant respectfully traverses the preceding rejections based on the following arguments. To establish a prima facie case of anticipation, the cited reference (i.e. Tran) should teach, suggest or disclose all claim limitations.

From Fig.2, lines 14-15, col.3 and lines 32-33 col.6, in Tran, there disclose"both uplink and downlink consist of frames containing eight time slots each," and "the time slot continues to be an packet time slot (P=1)." In other words, Tran discloses each time interval of the channels is equal to a width of the time slot; that is, in Tran, the claimed X is equal to 1.

Also, as shown in Fig.3, in Tran, each frame (channel) is composed of consecutive time slots numbered as 0-7 and each time slot is a time interval of signal transmission. In other words, in Tran, there is only one repeat time the same as the width of the time slot; that is, in Tran, the claimed M is equal to 1.

Accordingly, Tran fails to teach, suggest or disclose "a width of the time slot is X times of a maximum value of all the time intervals, and **X is a positive number equal or larger than 2**; each of the channels is generated by a permutation of at least one repeat time, and the repeat time is M times of the width of the time slot, wherein **M is an integer larger than 1** (emphases added)," as claimed in amended claims 1 and 6. Hence, the amended claims 1 and 6 are not anticipated by Tran, and accordingly patentable.

Regarding dependent claims 2-5 and 7-14, they should be patentable for the reason that they contain all limitation of their respective patentable base claims 1 and 6.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-14 are

in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If

the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of

the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date :

May 5, 2008

Belinda Lee
Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
        Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw